

October 16, 1967

and nursed him for nine days. And then when he died, she wrote his father, an Illinois preacher, a beautiful letter of sympathy. She stated: "His wound bled profusely, and he suffered a great deal, but did not complain. He was perfectly conscious to the last." On the other side, there's a dramatic letter written by J. R. Montgomery, of Mississippi, while he was dying on the battle field of Spotsylvania. He wrote his father May 10, 1864: "My friend Fairfax will write you a letter and tell you the circumstances of my death." His friend Fairfax did write the letter, and it's preserved with Montgomery's letter in the Confederate Museum. Fairfax told the father that the young man lingered until the morning of May 14. He added: "I have never witnessed such an exhibition of fortitude and Christian resignation. . . . No word of complaint escaped his lips. . . . He retained his consciousness to the last."

Consider the circumstances. Horribly wounded in the right shoulder on the evening of May 10, young Montgomery lingered until the morning of May 15.

He probably had the benefit of no palliative of any kind because anesthetics were in very short supply on the Confederate side at this time. "He retained his consciousness to the last." "No word of complaint escaped his lips." Thus a brave boy died, and in this record of his death, he eloquently bore witness to the great tragedy that was the American Civil War.

What does all of this add up to? It proves the essential soundness of the masses. In their Civil War conduct, the lowly people North and South, white and black, demonstrated that they are as richly endowed with the qualities that count in good citizenship as are members of any other group in Society. They also provided a convincing testimonial to the soundness of democratic government. They gave a resounding affirmation to the question raised by Lincoln at Gettysburg: "Can a nation conceived in Liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal long endure?" In this their time of testing the common folk justified the faith that had been reposed in them by the founding fathers. They proved that a self-governing people could quarrel and fight and come together again and build on the ruins of war a great and an enduring nation.

The Civil War soldiers, blue and gray, who joined battle in bloody and earnest conflict at Manassas, Shiloh, Antietam, Fredericksburg, Gettysburg, and Spotsylvania proved themselves worthy ancestors of the khaki clad heroes of Normandy, Korea, and Viet Nam. These soldiers and those of our other wars, along with the women who supported them as nurses and comrades, helped vouchsafe the liberty won at Lexington, Concord, Trenton, Kings Mountain, and Yorktown.

### ABM Obsolete?

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN**  
OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Monday, October 16, 1967

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, British Defense Secretary Denis Healey several days ago referred to the proposed ABM defense system around the United States as obsolete.

The following story about the Secretary's reference to the ABM system appeared in the Washington Post on Tuesday, October 3:

#### ABM OBSOLETE, BRITISH DEFENSE CHIEF SUGGESTS

SCARBOROUGH, ENGLAND—Defense Secretary Denis Healey said last night that the projected U.S. antiballistic missile system could prove obsolete even before it is deployed against a possible Red Chinese attack.

Healey said there is no evidence that any ABM system now conceived could produce meaningful defense against a major nuclear attack.

He said the system being planned by the United States could provide only "marginal and temporary" protection and, further, that it poses the danger of an accelerated arms race between East and West.

McNamara, in announcing the \$5 billion ABM defense, said it was intended as an answer to the intercontinental ballistic missile system China is expected to have in the early 1970s.

Healey spoke to a meeting of the Fabian Society after the opening of the Labor Party convention here.

### Couple Celebrates 50th Anniversary With 12 Graduated

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. DAVID PRYOR**

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 16, 1967

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, recently in the city of Pine Bluff, Ark., a very fine couple, Rev. and Mrs. George D. McKinney, Sr., celebrated their 50th wedding anniversary.

Theirs is a story of great inspiration to all Americans inasmuch as the sacrifices the McKinneys made in order to educate their 12 children through college depict the true character of this fine family.

Mr. Speaker, I am enclosing herewith the article which tells the story of the George D. McKinney family:

COUPLE CELEBRATES 50TH, WITH 12 GRADUATED  
(By Garland Bradshaw)

From all parts of the country—from as far away as California—they began arriving Saturday at a modest home at 1700 Havis Street for a festive occasion.

Reverend and Mrs. George D. McKinney Sr. were celebrating their 50th wedding anniversary there, and about 50 members of their families were honoring them with a reunion.

The celebration was climaxed with a dinner and a reception in the Student Union at Arkansas AM&N College.

For McKinney, 73, it was a big moment in a life of struggle, setback—and success.

McKinney was born near Summerville, Tennessee, in 1894, the son of a former slave. His father moved the family to Marianna, Arkansas, in 1906, where he worked as a farmer and an engineer in steam-operated cotton gins and rice mills.

McKinney said he remembered his father as a hard-working man who liked to hunt.

McKinney has been pastor of the Smith Temple of the Church of God in Christ, 2121 Havis Street, since 1940. He founded a church at Jonesboro in 1920 and was its pastor until 1937.

He was forced, by the Depression, to terminate his formal education after the seventh grade. "Being the oldest son of eight children, I had to go to work to help support

the family," McKinney said during an interview.

He continued to study through a correspondence school and worked as a farmer and shoe repairman.

He married the former Rose Anna Thompson at Rondo (Lee County) in 1917 and was ordained into the ministry in 1924.

The McKinneys had 14 children—seven boys and seven girls. One girl was stillborn and another died at the age of 10.

All 12 of the children have completed college and are working in a variety of professions. Six of them graduated from AM&N.

There are two pastors, two teachers, two secretaries, a lawyer, a businessman, a nurse, a dentist and a college registrar.

Ernest, the youngest son, returned July 7 from a one-and-a-half year "Peace Corps assignment" at Addis Abbaba, Ethiopia. He will enter the University of Arkansas School of Law at Fayetteville this fall.

McKinney is proud of his family and what it has accomplished.

How did 12 children, only two generations removed from slavery, manage to achieve such a record?

"There is one secret," McKinney said. "They desired within themselves to get an education and improve themselves."

He said education as a means of advancement was always stressed, and the children took advantage of the opportunities they had.

He said he and his wife financed the education of the eldest child, Izora, and he in turn helped the next child to complete his education. Each child would complete his education and, when he achieved a sound financial position, help the next and so on until they had all graduated.

Improvements in his own neighborhood came to mind as McKinney talked about changes he had observed over the years.

He said paved streets—"We've come out of the dust"—and better quality homes were what he would like to see more in Pine Bluff. He said he had also been impressed with the growth at AM&N and the job it had done.

McKinney said he likes to care for his lawn. That's part of his philosophy: "Just keep active."

### The Administration's Tax Program Benefits the American Farmer

#### SPEECH OF

**HON. DONALD M. FRASER**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 1967

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, in the current debate on fiscal policy, one of the main issues in the debate—the actual effects of the surtax proposal—is being buried by a smokescreen of charge and countercharge.

Coming from Minnesota, a State where agriculture is an important part of the economy, I have been interested in the effects which the surtax would have on the American farmer—a mainstay of American society.

I would recall that the administration's surtax proposal falls least heavily on those in the lowest income brackets. For example, 60 percent of all farm families in the United States fall below the adjusted gross income of \$5,000 a year, and are therefore completely exempt

from paying the surcharge. But, without the passage of the surtax, aggravated inflation will cause interest rates on credit to go up. The credit market will contract. Government agencies which offer credit to farmers for a multitude of purposes will be forced to curtail their activities, and millions of farm families could suffer.

In addition, there are other compelling reasons why the American farmer should support this surtax proposal. It will mean stable prices. It will mean a good supply of credit.

And it will help sustain almost 7 years of prosperity the Nation has enjoyed under Democratic administrations.

I urge the House to approve the President's 1968 budget, and the 10-percent surtax along with it.

Each day of hesitation increases our Government's financial problems.

### A Determined President States His Credo on Vietnam

SPEECH  
OF

**HON. ARNOLD OLSEN**

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Thursday, October 12, 1967

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, those of us who absolutely want to support the men we have sent to Vietnam should take particular note of the President's speech in San Antonio.

Surely all need not agree on every aspect of this complex problem, but I believe all must support the President, the Commander in Chief, until we can have an honorable peace in Vietnam.

Everyone knows I have sent my private advice to the President. I do not always agree with him, but I do agree that we cannot weaken the support of our fighting men in Vietnam.

The Kansas City Star of October 2 described President Johnson's recent Vietnam speech in San Antonio as "a spine-stiffening speech."

It was not only that. It was a clear restatement of the American position. It was a statement of a President's faith in the ability of his country to continue to bear the burden of the long battle against Communist insurgency.

This is not the first time a President of the United States and the American people have had to bear such a burden.

Still, the American quest for peace is as strong and determined as its resolve to resist Communist force.

The United States is not mindless of its ultimate goals, as some critics assert.

We are not cold to the sacrifices of men and materials, as some proclaim.

We are not 100-percent sure that we are 100-percent perfect.

But, what we must never forget is the basic purpose of our efforts.

We must prevent the political murder of a nation, South Vietnam, just as we would expect free nations to defend the attempted political murder of the United States.

When Americans fought for freedom against the Nazis and the Fascists in World War II, they were fighting to undo the political murders of an alarmingly long list of once free nations. Korea and Vietnam are different only in degree. Communist aggression; Communist takeover is no different from any other takeover—and we must resist it with all our might.

History will demonstrate that the strong Presidents invariably act right when the times call them to make great decisions.

I insert in the Record an editorial from the Kansas City Star of October 2, entitled "A Spine-Stiffening Speech: L. B. J. on Vietnam."

A SPINE-STIFFENING SPEECH: L. B. J. ON  
VIETNAM

It was a strong and clear address, the most forthright and in some ways the most informative that President Johnson has made on the Vietnam war in more than two years. In San Antonio Friday night, Mr. Johnson undertook to stiffen the spine of the American people as the rising casualties of the conflict and the tortuous search for peace continue simultaneously.

The President's defense of United States policy in Vietnam was an updating of the declaration he delivered at Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore on April 7, 1965. Since then he has been far from silent on Vietnam. But, as events have brought change both on the war front and in attitudes toward the fighting both at home and in foreign countries, the President has not reported on developments and clarified the complex subject as much and as often as its importance has warranted.

This inadequacy of explanation by the highest level of the U.S. government has contributed, we feel, to the recent slippage in American public support of the administration's war policy. The President is not only aware of this loss but is concerned about it. In public and in private, he has been testy at times about his dovish critics. Lately he has had to face up to the hard truth that the criticism has grown, even spreading to seemed to be cohesive behind the government's stand in Southeast Asia.

In his Texas address, Lyndon Johnson was imploring the American people not to lose heart. He was telling the nation and the free world that the cause of Vietnam is worthy and that it will not be abandoned.

Yet the President did not speak in absolute terms when he discussed the larger meaning of the struggle. He acknowledged that he could not say "with certainty" that a Communist conquest of South Vietnam "would be followed by a Communist conquest of Southeast Asia." Nor did he presume to assert "with certainty" that "a Southeast Asia dominated by Communist power would bring a third World war much closer to reality." Still he spoke of his conviction that "in Vietnam, we are reducing the chances of a larger war—perhaps a nuclear war."

Scoffers, whose reaction on anything pertaining to Vietnam has become 100 per cent predictable, quickly replied that the President had misread history, that no lightning out of Southeast Asia could ever strike the world with a nuclear holocaust. They said this, but they don't really know.

A limited war in which the great atomic powers have vital interests could lead to unlimited conflict. The objectives of Nazi Germany and Japan professed in 1940-41 were limited at first. With success, these regional goals of authoritarian power became worldwide. The result was global war.

It could happen again. In Vietnam the purpose of the United States, in Mr. Johnson's words, is to save an independent coun-

try from "political murder" and thereby stand by the obligations of three American administrations. But there is also, here as earlier in Korea, the aim of resisting aggression that constitutes a long-range threat to the entire non-Communist world. Thus the war will go on, with the United States eager to negotiate peace and ready to suspend its bombing of North Vietnam whenever a halt can lead promptly to productive discussions.

Once more the resolve of the United States to stand fast in Vietnam as long as it may take has been reaffirmed. But the door to peace remains open as far as this country is concerned. It's Hanoi's move, and a still-determined President Johnson could not have made that central fact of the war any plainer. He deserves the nation's support.

### The Irresistible Force of Optimism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

**HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER**

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Monday, October 16, 1967

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I attended a meeting of the Optimist Clubs of Kansas and had the privilege of hearing a fine speech delivered by Mr. Bill Newhouse, president of Optimist International. Mr. Newhouse, in his talk, focused on a timely subject—respect for law and order—and on the efforts of the Optimist Clubs in their individual communities to "untie the fetters of disrespect and substitute genuine concern for our fellow man." He has just completed a 3-week tour of the United States and Canada, speaking on this topic which is of increasing concern and interest to everyone.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to share these remarks, "The Irresistible Force of Optimism," with my colleagues and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

#### THE IRRESISTIBLE FORCE OF OTIMISM

As Optimist International approaches its fiftieth anniversary, as we strive diligently for an intermediate goal of 100,000 members, as we engage in the work of service for our fellow man, we reflect from time to time upon our future. Where do we go from here? For many decades optimists have labored from ocean to ocean on behalf of our boys. Many are the lads who have received the fruits of our heartfelt efforts; many are the youngsters who have grown into manhood to carve their places on the mantle of community endeavor. But the task remains undone. Thousands of spritely boys emerge each year and the pursuit of boy's work remains unfulfilled.

Ever vigilant in the quest for helping more boys, we should ponder the broader objectives of the philosophy of optimism. It is not enough to concentrate all our efforts in the realm of boy's work. Should we shoulder the irresistible force of optimism toward other worthy causes? Stated another way, is there a need for a broader concept of community service?

Years ago service clubs were organized largely to promote fellowship and self-serving interests. From this rather selfish inception new theories of service to the community evolved. Some one thought that people in need could be helped. And another man may have thought that a group of workers was more likely to do the job better than one man. Maurice Maeterlinck, the Bel-